

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith. The present Amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1-8 are pending in this application. Claims 1 and 5, which are independent, have been amended. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the Specification as originally filed and specifically at pages 11 and 12. It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, were in full compliance with the requirements 35 U.S.C. §112. No new matter has been introduced by this amendment. Changes to claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which the Applicant is entitled.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over European Patent Application 0 865 192 A2 to Yamakita (hereinafter, merely “Yamakita”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,092,114 to Shaffer, et al. (hereinafter, merely “Shaffer”) and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2006/0143307 to Codignotto (hereinafter, merely “Codignotto”).

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

“...wherein a unique processing command for the transmitting electronic device is processed when the unique processing command is predetermined

between the transmitting electronic device and the relay server.” (Emphasis Added)

Claim 1 generally relates to a system that allows a user to take a picture and send the picture with a text command to a relay server instructing the relay server to process the picture as instructed by the command. When the command is predetermined at the relay server, the command may be unique to a user or transmitting electronic device.

Applicants submit that Yamakita, Shaffer, and Codignotto fail to teach or suggest the handling of unique processing commands. Furthermore, Yamakita, Shaffer, and Codignotto fail to teach or suggest that a unique processing command may be predetermined by the transmitting electronic device and the relay server.

As understood by Applicant, Yamakita relates to a portable terminal that transmits image data via a network and an apparatus for performing image processing based on a recognition result of received image data. A user of the portable terminal can send image data as an email by adding an email address and information indicating that the service being requested of the host device is mail transmission. Additionally, fax transmission can be requested from the host device. The cited portions of Yamakita, specifically column 9, lines 30-48, and column 10, lines 8-47, disclose that a user can attach a memo to image data. The inputted memo includes an email address and the words “Email Transmission”. The host service performs the service requested by the user in the memo of the transmitted image data.

As understood by Applicant, Shaffer relates to performing file-format conversions of electronics message attachments.

As understood by Applicant, Codignotto relates to a message publishing system configured to receive a message from a sender and identify the sender as an authorized sender

based on information associated with the message in comparison to the data in the sender account.

Applicant respectfully submits that nothing has been found in Yamakita, Shaffer, or Codignotto, taken alone or in combination, that would teach or suggest the above-identified features of claim 1.

Specifically, Applicant respectfully submits that Yamakita, Shaffer, and Codignotto fail to disclose or suggest that a unique processing command for the transmitting electronic device is processed when the unique processing command is predetermined between the transmitting electronic device and the relay server, as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, independent claim 1 is patentable.

For reasons similar to those described above, independent claim 5 is also believed to be patentable.

III. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims are each dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for at least the above-identified reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

Similarly, because Applicants maintain that all claims are allowable for at least the reasons presented hereinabove, in the interests of brevity, this response does not comment on each and every comment made by the Examiner in the Office Action. This should not be taken

as acquiescence of the substance of those comments, and Applicants reserve the right to address such comments.


CONCLUSION

In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of the statements appearing above with respect to the disclosures in the cited references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate the portion, or portions, of the reference, or references, providing the basis for a contrary view.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicant respectfully requests early passage to issue of the present application.

Please charge any fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicant

By 
Thomas F. Presson
Reg. No. 41,442
(212) 588-0800